

**State ESG: Selection Criteria for NOFA Applicants (State ESG Regulations § 8407)**

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

(a) All applications made pursuant to section [25 CCR 8403](#) will be evaluated using the criteria below and ranked according to subdivision (g) below. Where applications requesting funds for more than one program are permitted in the NOFA, each program will receive a separate score for each rating factor, and the point scores will be averaged to calculate a final point score for each rating factor.

**1. Applicant Experience – 20 points**

<b>Weak Experience</b>	<b>Some Experience</b>	<b>Strong Experience</b>
The Applicant appears to have very minimal or none of the necessary competencies, skill set, and capacity to successfully manage the project (documentation is unclear).	The Applicant appears to have some of the necessary competencies, skill set, management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project (documentation is unclear)	The Applicant clearly documents or shows evidence of the necessary competencies, skill set, management capacity, professional experience and qualifications to successfully manage and complete the project.
<b>0-6 points</b>	<b>7-13 points</b>	<b>14-20 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

**2. Need for Funds – 10 points**

<b>Little Need</b>	<b>Some Need</b>	<b>Great Need</b>
Project is an activity, or targets a subpopulation, that is not determined to be a high need as identified by the Continuum of Care. The need appears questionable as to its significance and seriousness to the community. The project will provide a benefit but the benefit is indirect and will not have an impact to the community.	Project is an activity, or targets a subpopulation, that is determined to be of some need as identified by the Continuum of Care. The applicant describes the need but not clearly or completely and provides no supporting documents. The project will provide a direct benefit to the target population but the project will have a moderate impact to the community.	Project is an activity, or targets a subpopulation, that is determined to be of some need as identified by the Continuum of Care. The applicant clearly describes a serious community need that the project will address and provides supporting documents and statistics.
<b>0-3 points</b>	<b>4-7 points</b>	<b>8-10 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

**3. Program Design – 20 points**

<b>Inconsistent with Continuum of Care Standards and Core Practices</b>	<b>Somewhat consistent with Continuum of Care Standards and Core Practices</b>	<b>Consistent with Continuum of Care Standards and Core Practices</b>
Does not meet or meets very little of Continuum of Care Standards and Core Practices ( <a href="#">Section 8409</a> ). Provider guidelines for governing operations are unclear, and staffing, activities, and budget are not aligned with program design, target population, and local conditions.	Program objective is mostly consistent with Written Standards of the Continuum of Care and Core Practices ( <a href="#">Section 8409</a> ). Provider guidelines for governing operations are generally stated. Staffing, activities and budget are reasonable given program design, target population, and local conditions.	Clearly outlines program objective and is consistent with Written Standards of the Continuum of Care and Core Practices ( <a href="#">Section 8409</a> ). Uses evidenced based or best practices as identified by the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness. Program staffing patterns, activities, budget are reasonable relative to program design, target population and local conditions.
<b>0-6 points</b>	<b>7-13 points</b>	<b>14-20 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

**4. Impact and Effectiveness – 30 points** (Metrics include: successful exits to permanent housing, completion of services)

<b>Weak Impact</b>	<b>Moderate Impact</b>	<b>Strong Impact</b>
Project does not demonstrate capability to contribute to system-wide impact effectiveness.	Project demonstrates, through project description and similar project experience, the capability to meet performance measures for system-wide performance outcomes. There may be HMIS supporting data that the proposed project and program will achieve its goals (if applicable)	Project demonstrates, through clearly outlined plan and similar project experience, the capability to meet performance measures for system-wide performance outcomes. There is strong HMIS/CAPER supporting data from previous years that the proposed project and program will achieve its goals (if applicable, use HMIS or other equivalent data for new applicants)
<b>0-10 points</b>	<b>11-20 points</b>	<b>21-30 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

**5. Cost Efficiency – 10 points** (based on ESG project budget, only)

<b>Inefficient</b>	<b>Somewhat Efficient</b>	<b>Strong Efficacy/Efficiency</b>
Cost per exit to permanent housing is inordinately high relative to programs, population served, and services being offered.	Cost per exit to permanent housing is within reason, given project scope, population to be served, and services being offered.	Cost per exit to permanent housing is effective and efficient for the population being served, using leverage to lower ESG program costs.
<b>0-3 points</b>	<b>4-7 points</b>	<b>8-10 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

**6. County Objectives (as based on Federal funding priorities) – 10 points:** Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

<b>No Objectives/Few Objectives met</b>	<b>Some Objectives met</b>	<b>Strong Adherence to Objectives</b>
Does not meet any funding priority.	Meets some funding priorities	Meets funding priorities
<b>0-3 points</b>	<b>4-7 points</b>	<b>8-10 points</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Please briefly explain your reasoning:

Scores from all the previous questions:

1. _____/20	4. _____/30
2. _____/10	5. _____/10
3. _____/20	6. _____/10

**Total:** \_\_\_\_\_ (Out of 100 points)